

REMARKS

Claims 35-64 and 66-67 are pending. Claims 35 and 67 have been amended to correct minor informalities. No new matter is added by virtue of the within amendments. Indeed, they are non-substantive.

Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter, i.e. that claims 35-64 and 66 are allowed. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 67 is allowable as well (as discussed below) and reconsideration of the application in that regard is respectfully requested.

Claim 67 is objected to for lacking a colon after the transitional phrase "comprising" in line 2. Appropriate correction of that minor informality has been made and withdrawal of the objection is proper. (Likewise, a similar amendment has been made to claim 35 to avoid a prospective objection.)

Claim 67 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) over Kiat et al. (US 6,250,318) in view of Johnson (US 5,334,352).

The rejection is traversed. The noted references, even in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in claim 67.

Claim 67 is directed to the preferred embodiment of the invention illustrated in Figure 6.

As recited in claim 67, this embodiment relates to a nozzle arrangement for releasing a treatment fluid, the nozzle arrangement comprising a longitudinal housing defining a fluid channel for feeding the treatment fluid from a fluid feed opening to at least one fluid delivery opening, the inner cross-section of the fluid channel reducing from the fluid feed opening in the longitudinal direction of the housing. In addition, the nozzle arrangement comprises at least one stiffening member extending in the longitudinal

direction of the nozzle arrangement in order to improve the stability of the nozzle arrangement.

According to claim 67, the fluid channel is defined within the housing by a first longitudinal insert. The first longitudinal insert (see reference numeral 3 in Fig. 6) is wedge-shaped and has an increasing thickness from the fluid feed opening along its longitudinal direction. The second longitudinal insert (see reference numeral 3') has a constant thickness in the longitudinal direction and has a plurality of distribution openings spaced from one another in the longitudinal direction, so that the distribution openings are in fluid communication both with the at least one fluid delivery opening and with the fluid channel in order to feed the treatment fluid from the fluid channel via the distribution openings to the at least one fluid delivery opening.

Kiat et al. significantly differs from the invention recited in claim 67 in that this reference discloses a nozzle arrangement having only one insert (which corresponds to reference numeral 1280 in Figs. 18 and 19 of Kiat). This insert 1280 has an increasing thickness in the longitudinal direction of the nozzle arrangement.

However, Kiat et al. fails to disclose a second insert having a constant thickness in the longitudinal direction of the housing and having a plurality of distribution openings spaced from one another in the longitudinal direction. Moreover, Kiat does not disclose any distribution openings.

Finally, Kiat does also not disclose any stiffening member.

With respect to Johnson, this reference merely relates to a manifold for splitting a fluid flow from an inward passage among a multiplicity of outlet passages (see column 1, lines 6-9 of Johnson). The manifold 10 shown in Figs. 1-3 of Johnson has an elongated cavity 13 whose cross-sectional area 19 is adjusted by placing one or more inserts 22 into this cavity 13. However, contrary to the features recited in independent claim 67, Johnson's inserts 22 do not have a plurality of distribution openings spaced

from one another in the longitudinal direction. Instead, as shown in Figs. 6 and 7 of Johnson, each insert 22 has two legs 49, 52 extending in its longitudinal direction having a leg separation distance 57 therebetween (see column 5, lines 11-17).

In addition, the insert 22 of Johnson does not have a constant thickness in the longitudinal direction of the nozzle arrangement, which is also contrary to the features recited in claim 67.

Accordingly, Johnson fails to remedy the deficiencies of Kiat.

Finally, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious for a skilled person to combine the teaching of Kiat et al. with that of Johnson as there is no clear motivation for the skilled person to do so. A combination of the nozzle arrangement of Kiat et al. with that of Johnson would also not lead to a fully functioning and operative nozzle arrangement. In that regard, it is noted that neither Kiat et al. nor Johnson disclose a nozzle arrangement having two separate inserts. That alone is a significant and structurally distinct feature of the invention as recited in claim 67.

For all of the foregoing reasons, the obviousness rejection is properly withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

FEE AUTHORIZATION

Should any fees be asserted, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees (or credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 04-1105, Reference No. 63265(45107).

Application No. 10/536,624
Amendment dated October 27, 2009
After Final Office Action of August 28, 2009

13

Docket No.: 63265(45107)

Dated: October 27, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Christine C. O'Day/
Christine C. O'Day

Registration No.: 38,256

George N. Chaclas

Registration No.: 46,608

EDWARDS ANGELL PALMER & DODGE
LLP

P.O. Box 55874

Boston, Massachusetts 02205

(617) 517-5558

Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Customer No. 21874